

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

MORGAN LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP 1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW WASHINGTON, DC 20004

COPY MAILED

APR 2 6 2007

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of

Chang-Seok Geum

Application No. 10/660,655 : ON I

Filed: September 12, 2003

Attorney Docket No. 041993-5220

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition, filed September 28, 2006, under 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(c). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Commissioner may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(III)(C) and (D). The instant petition lack(s) item(s) (1).

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to reply within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.113 in a timely manner to the final Office action mailed March 7, 2005, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. A reply under 37 CFR 1.113 is limited to an amendment that *prima facie* places the application in condition for allowance or a Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee required by 37 CFR 1.17(b)). No amendment *prima facie* placing the application in condition for allowance or Notice of Appeal (and appeal fee) was timely filed, and no extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on June 8, 2005.

Further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed as follows:

By mail:

Mail Stop PETITIONS

Commissioner for Patents
Post Office Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

By facsimile:

(571) 273-8300

ATTN: Office of Petitions

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3210.

Irvin Dingle

Petitions Examiner Office of Petitions

Attachment: Advisory Action

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/660,653 19/660,655	HORI, KOJI
Examiner	Art Unit
Michael Cleveland	1762

zororo are r ming or an rippour ziror	Examiner	Art Unit		
·	Michael Cleveland	1762		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 28 September 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the				
following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.		
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).				
AMENDMENTS 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.				
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 	• •	, timely filed amendm	ent canceling	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is profit The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 11-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1-10.		ill be entered and an	explanation of	
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the control				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowa	nce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).				
13.		Michael Cleveland Primary Examiner		

Art Unit: 1762

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: They do not identify any changes to the claims and therefore raise the question whether an amendment has been filed.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. Applicant merely denies that the references suggest the limitations "turning on or turning off a contact type switch by lifting up the body when the nozzle contacts the substrate" and "lifting up the body at a speed slower than a speed of lowering the body, so that the nozzle is isolated from the substrate". Applicant has not pointed to any alleged errors in the examiner's reasoning, which was clearly laid out as to these limitations on pp. 3-4 of the final Office Action mailed 3/7/2005.